

Appl. No. 10/020,529
Amdt. Dated July 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2005

Docket No. EN11358
Customer No. 27940

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12 remain in the application.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 112. Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite the — sliding latch — rather than the “sliding switch means” recited due to an inadvertent typographical error. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being unpatentable over Humphreys, et al. (USPN 5,825,874), hereinafter “Humphreys”. Specifically, the Office Action (OA) submits that Humphreys teaches a holder with a rotating member 204a, a latching member 112a, a sliding latching member 114a, a detachable member 300 and a retention hood 100.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that when the detachable member is fixedly coupled to the rotating member, the detachable member is held to the rotational member by the retention hood and the sliding latch. Support for this amendment is found at page 6, line 21 through page 7, line 2 (in addition to FIGS. 11 and 12) of the specification, along with claim 1 as originally filed (final wherein clause).

Applicants respectfully submit that the sliding latch of Humphreys can only be elements 114a and 114b in FIGS. 5A-5C. The OA points to col. 6, lines 21-28 as providing support for the sliding latch in Humphreys. However, those passages talk about the latches 112a and 112b sliding. However, these elements, comprise the rotational member and latching means that the OA cites earlier. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the elements 112a and 112b can not be both the latching members and the sliding latch concurrently. The only elements in Humphreys that slide are elements 114a and 114b.

Applicants respectfully submit that Humphreys fails to teach a coupling of the detachable member to the rotational member as is claimed by Applicants. To be sure, the only member that couples the rotational member to the detachable member is element 112a. Applicants respectfully submit that element 112a is not both a retention hood and a sliding latch. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in light of the amendment and these comments.

Appl. No. 10/020,529
Amdt. Dated July 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2005

Docket No. EN11358
Customer No. 27940

Similarly, Applicants have amended claim 3 to recite that the detachable member is coupled to the rotating member by the retention hood at a first end and by the sliding latching member at the other. Support for this amendment is found at page 6, line 21 through page 7, line 2 (in addition to FIGS. 11 and 12) of the specification. As per the comments above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in light of the amendment and the comments above.

With respect to claims 4 and 5, as these claims are dependent from claim 3, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection with respect to these claims per the comments above as directed to claim 3.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphreys in view of Frank (USPN 6,002,765).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in light of the amendments to claim 3. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Frank nor Humphreys teach coupling a detachable device to a rotational member by way of a retention hood and a sliding latch. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphreys in view of Wang et al. (USPN 5,305,381), hereinafter "Wang".

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in light of the amendments to claim 3. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Wang nor Humphreys teach coupling a detachable device to a rotational member by way of a retention hood and a sliding latch. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Appl. No. 10/020,529
Amdt. Dated July 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2005

Docket No. EN11358
Customer No. 27940

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

If any matter with respect to this application would be more easily handled by telephone, Applicants' attorney is available at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
1700 Belle Meade Court
Energy Systems Group
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
Customer Number: 27940

By: 

Philip H. Burrus, IV
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,432

Telephone: 770.338.3614
Fax No.: 770.338.3557